

o Assumptions and Beliefs  
of Selected Members  
of the  
Academic Community

By NASPA Division of Research and Publications

NASPA

THE  
JOURNAL  
of the  
Association  
of  
Deans  
and  
Administrators  
of  
Student Affairs

Monograph No. 3, April 1970

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES



# National Association of Student Personnel Administrators

## (THE ASSOCIATION OF DEANS AND ADMINISTRATORS OF STUDENT AFFAIRS FOUNDED IN 1919)

### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

- President**  
Mark W. Smith  
Dean of Men  
Donison University
- President Elect**  
Earle W. Clifford  
Dean of Student Affairs  
Rutgers Univ., New Brunswick
- Conference Chairman**  
Thomas B. Dutton  
Dean of Students  
Oakland University
- Conference Chairman Elect**  
Richard A. Sigelkow  
Vice-President for Student Affairs  
SUNY at Buffalo
- Journal Editor**  
Robert H. Shaffer  
Professor of Education  
Indiana University
- Placement Officer**  
Richard E. Hulet, Executive  
Committee Secretary  
Vice Pres. for Student Services  
Illinois State University, Normal
- Controller**  
J. Don Marsh  
University Relations  
Wayne State University
- Immediate Past President**  
O. D. Roberts  
Dean of Men  
Purdue University
- Regional Vice President**  
I William F. Field  
Dean of Students  
Univ. of Massachusetts, Amherst
- II Preston Parr**  
Dean of Student Life  
Lehigh University
- III John L. Blackburn**  
Dean for Student Development  
University of Alabama
- IV Norman T. Oppelt (West)**  
Dean of Students  
Colorado State College
- IV Robert F. Etheridge (East)**  
Vice Pres. for Student Affairs  
Miami University
- V Channing Briggs**  
Dean of Students  
Portland State College
- VI Stanley Benz**  
Dean of Students  
San Jose State College

### DIVISION DIRECTORS

- Professional Relations and Legislation**  
Merrill C. Beyerl  
Vice President for Student Affairs  
Ball State University
- Professional Development and Standards**  
Neal R. Berte  
Executive Assistant to the Pres.  
Ottawa University
- Research and Program Development**  
James R. Appleton  
Assoc. Dean of Students and  
Dean of Men  
Oakland University
- Association Personnel and Services**  
William A. Yardley  
Dean of Students  
University of Houston

### EDITORIAL BOARD

- |  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <b>TERM EXPIRING 1972</b><br>JERRY H. GODARD<br>Executive Dean<br>Guilford College<br>Greensboro, N. Carolina            | <b>TERM EXPIRING 1971</b><br>DONALD H. CHEEK<br>Dir. Black Studies Center<br>Claremont Colleges<br>Claremont, California | <b>TERM EXPIRING 1970</b><br>WHEADON BLOCH<br>Dean of Students<br>University of Missouri<br>Kansas City, Missouri   |
| GEORGE B. HIBBARD<br>Dean of Students<br>California State College<br>Bakersfield<br>Bakersfield, California              | JOHN GILLIS<br>Executive Associate<br>Association of American<br>Colleges<br>Washington, D. C.                           | JOHN E. SHAY, JR.<br>Dean of Students<br>College of the Holy Cross<br>Worcester, Massachusetts  |
| JOE A. HOWELL<br>Dean of Students<br>Southern Methodist Univ.<br>Dallas, Texas   | SISTER MAUREEN<br>McCORMACK<br>Dean of Students<br>Loretto Heights College<br>Denver, Colorado                           | ALLEN E. IVEY<br>Professor of Education<br>University of<br>Massachusetts<br>Amherst, Massachusetts   |
| TIMOTHY LANGSTON<br>Director, Residence Hall<br>Programs<br>Pennsylvania State Univ.<br>University Park,<br>Pennsylvania | C. WILTON PRUITT<br>Professor of Education<br>Queens College<br>New York, New York                                       | THEODORE K. MILLER<br>Associate Professor of<br>Education<br>University of Georgia<br>Athens, Georgia   |
| EMILY TAYLOR<br>Dean of Women<br>University of Kansas<br>Lawrence, Kansas  | ROBERT McCLEERY<br>Dean of Students<br>Whitworth College<br>Spokane, Washington  | WARREN SHIRLEY<br>Dean of Students<br>Florida A. & M.<br>University<br>Tallahassee, Florida   |
| DANIEL B. WOLF<br>Associate Editor<br>Assistant Dean<br>Indiana University,<br>Indianapolis<br>Indianapolis, Indiana     | ROBERT H. SHAFER<br>Editor<br>Professor of Education<br>Indiana University<br>Bloomington, Indiana                       | ROBERT M. CRANE<br>Assistant Editor<br>Professor of Education<br>(On leave)<br>Sr. Assoc. in Residence<br>Illinois State Board<br>of Education<br>Chicago, Illinois |

**MANUSCRIPTS:** Manuscripts should be addressed to The Editor, NASPA Journal, 809 E. Seventh St., Bloomington, Ind. 47401. Style should follow *A Manual of Style*, 12th edition, revised, University of Chicago Press.

**SUBSCRIPTIONS:** Annual subscription rate is \$6.00; single copies, \$1.50. Checks should be made payable to NASPA and mailed to Controller, J. Don Marsh, NASPA Central Office, Suite 405, Bellcrest Hotel, 5440 Cass Avenue, Detroit, Michigan 48202. CHANGE OF ADDRESS should be sent to the Controller.

**EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS:** Ray A. Muston and Suzann M. Owen.

### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS-AT-LARGE

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Peter H. Armarost,<br>President<br>Ottawa University, Kansas       | T. Roger Nudd<br>Associate Dean of Students and<br>Director of Student Activities<br>California State College at Fullerton |
| Donald H. Cheek<br>Dir. Black Studies Center<br>Claremont Colleges | Chester E. Peters<br>Vice President for Student Affairs<br>Kansas State University   |

# Assumptions and Beliefs of Selected Members of the Academic Community

**A Special Report  
of  
the NASPA Division of Research  
and Program Development**

**Prepared and Presented  
by  
Thomas B. Dutton,  
James R. Appleton, and  
Edward E. Birch**

**April 1970**

LB

2331.7

.D98

## Table of Contents

Introductory Remarks: Purpose of the Study .....	1
Design and Methodology .....	3
Analysis of Results .....	5
The Role and Responsibilities of the Dean of Students —	
Basic Assumptions and Beliefs .....	5
Perceptions of the Role and Responsibilities of the	
Dean of Students .....	8
Preferred Role of the Dean of Student in Policy Formulation .....	8
Evaluation of the Dean of Students' Performance .....	9
The Student and the Educational Process —	
Social Maturity and Value Development .....	10
Control and Regulation .....	10
The Need to Personalize the Educational Experience .....	11
Dissent as a Vehicle for Learning .....	12
Manipulation of the Environment .....	12
Summary .....	13
Campus Governance and Decision Making —	
Reasons for Student Involvement in Governance	
and Decision-Making .....	14
Perceptions of the Dean of Students' Response Regarding	
Student Participation in Governance and Decision-Making .....	15
To What Degree Should Faculty, Administrators and Students	
Be Involved in Governance and Decision-Making? .....	15
Summary .....	17
Summary, Implications and Personal Observations .....	19
Summary .....	19
Implications and Personal Observations .....	23
Appendix A: Questionnaires Used in the Study .....	31
Appendix B: Tables 1 - 13 .....	37

# **List of Tables**

- Table 1: Institutional Affiliation by Type, Size and Regional Accrediting Agency**
- Table 2: Comparison of Sample with NASPA Membership for Goodness of Fit**
- Table 3: Justification for Use of Chi-square as an Appropriate Method of Analysis**
- Table 4: Differences in the Dean of Students' Assumptions and Beliefs by Type, Size and Regional Accrediting Agency**
- Table 5: Comparison of Assumptions and Beliefs Among Selected Members of the Academic Community**
- Table 6: Comparison of the Deans of Students' Assumptions and Beliefs with the Perceptions of Them Held by Other Participants**
- Table 7: Comparison of the Deans of Students' Assumptions and Beliefs with Each of the Other Participants'**
- Table 8: Comparison of the Deans of Students' Assumptions and Beliefs with the Perceptions of His Assumptions and Beliefs Held by Each of the Other Participants**
- Table 9: Comparison of the Assumptions and Beliefs of Each of the Other Four Participants with What Each Thought a Dean of Students Assumes and Believes**
- Table 10: Preferred Role of the Dean of Students in Policy Formulation in Student Affairs**
- Table 11: Comparison of the Deans of Students' Perceptions of Their Presidents' Evaluative Criteria with Criteria Actually Reported by the Presidents**
- Table 12: Principal Reasons for Involving Students in Policy Decisions**
- Table 13: To What Degree Should Members of the Academic Community Be Involved in Governance and Decision-Making?**

## Foreword

In January 1966, the Division of Research and Program Development, under the direction of Peter H. Armacost, initiated a study of certain convictions and values of student personnel administrators. Using that study as a foundation, the Division developed the present investigation, focusing on the assumptions and beliefs not only of student personnel administrators, but of certain other members of the academic community. An attempt was made, as well, to determine how members of the academic community currently *perceive* the role, convictions, and perspectives of the dean of students.

For some time, it has been clear to the Division that institutions, finding themselves increasingly in a state of conflict over crucial issues — much of it centering on the supposed assumptions and beliefs of members of the academic community — might find such information helpful. It has seemed that a greater understanding (of values, assumptions, etc.) on the part of the dean of students in particular would, at times, help him to make necessary adjustments in his own behavior and understand how to relate more effectively to other members of the academic community. It has seemed obvious to the Division that members of the academic community have varying perceptions of the role and function of the dean, and that these perceptions interfere with his ability to contribute to the learning process.

This study, then, was initiated in September 1968. It was designed and implemented by the writers with the assistance of the Division, using the instrument created for the 1966 study as a jumping-off point. Dr. Appleton and Dr. Birch did the essential computer programming and the statistical analyses; all three writers were responsible for analyzing the data and preparing this report.

The study could not have been completed without the support of a NASPA Executive Committee's commitment to sponsoring research and programs aimed at strengthening the position of the dean of students in the local setting. Special credit, of course, must be given to the students, faculty, presidents, and deans who provided data, and we gratefully acknowledge their contributions. We are also indebted to Irvin J. Lehmann for his help in research design, and to James M. Peters for his editorial assistance in preparing this report.

As is true of most research efforts, more data were gathered than could be analyzed, interpreted, and presented at one time. The writers

have attempted to include those results that seem to have greatest implications for the dean in his daily work. The interested reader is encouraged to review Tables 5, 6, and 10-13, Appendix B, to gain further insight into data of particular interest. The writers were also intent on publishing the document while the data were still relevant; hopefully timeliness will compensate for any omissions in the report.

It is our hope that NASPA members and institutions will study the results and conclusion of this investigation and that it will spark interest among those members of the academic community who will read it. The effort devoted to the study will have been justified if it stimulates even limited discussion and thought concerning the values, assumptions, beliefs, and convictions of the members of the academic community, and of how they might better work together in the resolution of important and critical issues. For "dialogue" — albeit on the basis of differences among members of the academic community — would seem to present a far better solution to conflict than the confrontation politics of the manned barricade.



## Introductory Remarks: Purpose of the Study

This report presents the results of a study of the assumptions and beliefs of students, faculty, college and university presidents, and deans of students regarding important issues in higher education and — perhaps just as important — of their perceptions of the role, convictions, and perspectives of the dean of students. An important, underlying premise is that administrators, faculty, and students — with varying degrees of awareness — make assumptions and hold beliefs that determine their behavior in response to campus problems.

The Division of Research and Program Development undertook this research for several reasons.<sup>1</sup> It is obvious that members of the academic community have varying conceptions of educational purpose and issues. Students, for example, may perceive the primary mission of the institution to be quite at variance with the perceptions of institutional direction held by the faculty and administration. The faculty may view the learning process differently than other members of the academic community; the administration may feel that conduct regulations are necessary and justified for quite different reasons than those held by other members in the institution. This would seem natural because students, faculty, and administration tend to have different backgrounds, needs, and perspectives, and perform diverse roles in the community. The variety of perceptions of mission and means is a major cause of conflict at varying levels of intensity. In dealing with the resolution of problems one must understand the bases of such conflict. It is not surprising that opposing views on important issues generate tension and confrontation, but what is surprising is that institutions too often fail to recognize this fact in attempting to resolve or to understand conflict.

Members of the academic community espouse positions on issues over time and tend to preserve such expressions as a basis for predicting future responses. Such predictions are natural (one might almost say they become instinctive), and are invaluable in human encounters as long as adequate data are available for making judgments. The problem is that, too often, predictions are based on faulty data, and that

<sup>1</sup>Members were: Thomas B. Dutton (Director), Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Oakland University; Walter Friesen, Dean of the University College, Wichita State College; W. Harold Grant, Associate Professor of Administration and Higher Education, Michigan State University; O. W. Lacy, Dean of Students, Franklin and Marshall College; Martin J. Meade, Vice President for Student Personnel Services, Fordham University; and Mark W. Smith, Dean of Men, Denison University.

there is an inclination to overgeneralize and to project behavior appropriate to one situation into others. Moreover, misperception of values and convictions is a significant source of difficulty because it leads to blurred vision and strained relationships — unnecessarily blurred and unnecessarily strained. This, of course, makes it difficult to resolve conflict and to develop any basis for mutual cooperation and trust.

It is also possible that others may have reasonably correct perceptions, but that the person who is the source-object of the perceptions may be mistaken in, or unaware of, how he is actually viewed. In essence, the contrast may be sharp between how he sees himself and how others see him. This can easily result in failure to correct inappropriate behavior, which in turn can reduce job effectiveness. Inaccurate self-perception makes it more difficult to acquire the understanding and elicit the dialogue essential to the resolution of problems. More difficult, and it is hard enough to begin with!

Thus, an important dimension of the study centered on a comparison of the dean's assumptions and beliefs with others' views of him concerning the same assumptions and beliefs. In light of the prodigious challenges facing the dean today, it seems very important to the Division that he understand not only his own values and convictions, but how others perceive him — and the possibility of variance. Such awareness seems particularly important because in the midst of rapid change, beset by campus pressures, it is difficult to keep fundamental values and principles in focus and to achieve a proper sense of personal and professional direction. Pressures and demands on the dean of students require that he continually clarify and redefine his role, objectives, and convictions. The task may be complicated by increasing diffusion of institutional objectives and programs, growing depersonalization, and fragmentation in the academic community. Yet, such self-examination must be undertaken if the dean of students is to survive and have a meaningful place in higher education.

And very truly, the basic issue is that of survival, in an environment that requires flexibility and the ability to adjust rapidly to new conditions. If the dean of students is to be effective in this environment, he must comprehend the values and convictions that cause him to behave in particular ways and see how he might contribute in the greatest degree to the learning process. He must also be aware of how he is perceived by others and of role conflicts that tend to interfere with his ability to assist students in their development. Finally, he must have insight into the assumptions and beliefs of other members of the academic community so that he might better relate to them and resolve mutual differences.

## Design and Methodology

Data for the investigation were gathered through a questionnaire developed by the Division for the "convictions and values" research conducted by it in 1966. This original instrument underwent major revision after an analysis of data obtained from the 1966 investigation. Further revisions were made after a pilot study involving 20 chief student personnel administrators. In final form, slightly differing questionnaires were distributed to the chief student personnel officers, the presidents, faculty members holding the highest or a high *elected* position in the faculty senates or comparable bodies, the editors of the student newspapers, and the presidents of the student bodies of all 715 NASPA member institutions. (See Appendix A.) The research materials were mailed directly to the chief student personnel officer, who was asked to distribute the instruments to the other participants. Each participant returned his instrument directly to the researchers.

The questionnaire used in the study consisted of items related to approaches to learning and student development, control of student behavior, campus governance, and the role and administrative style of the dean of students. The questionnaire was designed to elicit response from the participants about their assumptions and beliefs in these areas and also to determine the perceptions of presidents, faculty, and students regarding their assumptions and beliefs about deans of students. Moreover, data were gathered on the dean's perception of the criteria used by his president to evaluate his (the dean's own) effectiveness and on the actual criteria employed by the president.

It is important to note that certain basic assumptions and limitations are inherent in the use of a mailed questionnaire in collecting data. For example, it must be assumed that the original intent of each statement is understood by the respondent, that each respondent answers honestly, and that the responses reflect the intent of the respondent. In addition, one of the difficulties in such a study is to account properly for factors of social direction that elicit responses more in harmony with their "social desirability" than with honest, personal beliefs. There can be no guarantee that the participants in the study were not occasionally influenced by factors other than their personal beliefs!

Although the basic content of the instrument given to each group of participants was the same, some differences should be noted. The

instruments designed for the students, faculty, and presidents asked the respondents to indicate not only how they felt about the items on the questionnaire, but also how they felt a dean of students would react to the items. In addition, both presidents and deans were asked to comment on criteria used by the presidents to evaluate the effectiveness of deans.

Data analysis included the tabulation of frequencies and computation of percentages for each item on the questionnaire, and comparison of responses by participant category through use of the chi-square test.

Most of the items on the questionnaire required an "agree" or "disagree" answer, or the simple checking of a response category. The responses of the deans and presidents to the question on the criteria employed to evaluate the effectiveness of the dean, however, were open-ended. To facilitate analysis of this item, response categories were developed as they emerged from the written comments — first by the three writers acting separately, and then in consultation with each other.

Usable returned questionnaires totaled 2,043. The number and percentage of usable responses in each participant category is presented below:

	N	%
Chief student Personnel Administrator	458	64.1
Faculty Member	430	60.1
President	414	57.9
Student Body President	394	55.1
Student Editor	347	48.5
TOTAL	2,043	

Table 1, Appendix B, presents the institutional affiliation by type, size, and region for each of the five participant groups. Also included as Table 2, is the analysis undertaken to determine whether or not, on the basis of these demographic variables (type, size, and regional location) the sample was representative of the total NASPA institutional membership at the time of the study. With little exception, it appears that the groups were representative, and that the results should not be ignored because of sample size.

Chi-square was the statistical technique used to determine how closely the observed number of responses in a given category approximated an expected theoretical distribution. The analysis was completed on the CDC 3600 computer and the appropriate complementary data processing equipment.

In certain portions of the study, comparisons are made among respondents which are not necessarily matched by institution. As may

be noted in Table 3, Appendix B, a defense has been mounted against this limitation. The analysis of results by use of chi-square, though not entirely appropriate, is the most conservative estimate of the real situation.

Finally, for the purpose of this study, the title "dean of students" or "dean" was considered to be synonymous with "chief student personnel administrator."

## **Analysis of Results**

Specifically, this study was designed to gather data in the following areas: (a) the role and responsibilities of the dean of students, (b) the student and the educational process, and (c) campus governance and decision-making. The presentation of data that follows has been structured around these three topics. In each section, data are presented on the assumptions and beliefs of the appropriate category of participants, how their responses compared with each other, and perceptions of students, faculty, and presidents regarding the assumptions and beliefs held by deans of students.

Few differences were noted in the assumptions and beliefs of chief student personnel officers when compared by type, size, or regional location. A summary of these data is included as Table 4, Appendix B, and some comment is included where appropriate in later sections of this report. No comparable analysis was completed of differences in the assumptions and beliefs of the faculty, presidents, or students.

### **The Role and Responsibilities of the Dean of Students**

*Basic Assumptions and Beliefs.*<sup>2</sup> Several items on the questionnaire were designed to determine the current attitude of members of the academic community regarding (1) the degree of "committedness" the dean should feel toward students (as opposed to his other responsibilities), (2) the extent to which he should be a "helper," or a dean *for* students rather than a dean of students, (3) his role in upholding traditional standards and institutional values, (4) whether he would violate the confidentiality of the counseling relationship, (5) his responsibility to the president in situations where his own personal convictions might run counter to those of the president, and (6) whether or not he should attempt to manipulate the academic environment in ways he feels might enhance student development.

With reference to the first matter, a substantial portion of all of

<sup>2</sup>See Tables 5 and 7, Items 1-9, 18, 22 and 23.

the respondents felt that the dean's primary responsibility should be to help students, rather than to perform administrative tasks. It is interesting to note not only that the deans themselves indicated the most agreement with this position, but that the smaller the institution, the more pronounced was the agreement. Presidents were less supportive; *i.e.*, presidents more often held that "other responsibilities" should take precedence over the deans' relationships with students.

There was also strong support for the view that the dean should be an advocate for students, and that his role should be so constructed as to reduce involvement in conflict with students and make him accessible to them. But, here some differences among participants were worthy of comment. For example, student respondents were less inclined to view counseling and discipline as interrelated responsibilities of the dean. It appears that they feel discipline interferes with counseling and renders the dean less effective as a source of help to students.

There was general agreement that the dean should engage in conflict with students when he disagrees with them, although student body presidents, as a group, are less supportive of this position. Both student body presidents and the editors felt more strongly than other respondents that the dean should attempt to disassociate himself from unpopular administrative decision. They seem to want him to avoid conflict with students so that they can more easily relate to him.

Another item on the questionnaire presented the proposition that the dean's effectiveness is reduced by over-concern with "control and order." With the exception of the presidents, about three-quarters of the respondents agreed with the statement. Only about two-thirds of the presidents agreed. Apparently, more presidents feel that maintenance of control and order is a major responsibility of the dean of students, and that, accordingly, such activity does not detract from his other duties.

Several items dealt with the dean's role in the support of campus standards and values. Responses varied considerably on these items. One, for example, indicated that the dean should uphold sensitive standards that could not be specified in a code of conduct. About half the deans, faculty, and students agreed with this position, although there was less support among the students and faculty. It is interesting to note, however, that nearly 70 percent of the presidents held that the dean should uphold these unspecified standards. They more often felt, too, that the dean should be concerned with the enforcement of specific moral standards. As one might expect, less than one-third of the students supported such a proposition; only 41 percent of the deans themselves preferred the "enforcer" role.



Should the dean attempt to influence students toward adopting values held to be important by the institution? Students overwhelmingly felt that he should not. They indicated that such attempts by the dean constitute questionable behavior. The presidents, on the other hand, indicated strongly that deans should reinforce institutional values; to a lesser degree, deans and faculty members agreed.

The respondents were also asked to record whether the dean should maintain the confidentiality of a counseling relationship. Not surprisingly, about 90 percent felt that one should honor such confidentiality. This concern for protection of the student is consistent with data already presented on the commitment of the dean to student welfare.

Another item on the questionnaire stated that the dean's responsibility to his president should take precedence over his own personal convictions. Two-thirds or more of each group of respondents disagreed with the statement, and the disagreement was most substantial among students and faculty. As might be expected, more presidents felt that the dean's convictions should be subordinated, if necessary, and more in the direction of acquiescence with the president's.

One additional item dealing with the role of the dean is worthy of comment. (It is also considered in a later section.) Should the dean manipulate the environment to promote student development? Again, there was substantial agreement with the statement, but there are some interesting variations. Generally, the deans were most supportive of the statement, the students much less so — not surprisingly, perhaps, since "manipulation" of any type by administrators, or The Establishment, tends to generate negative feelings among students.

In summary, what can be concluded from this study about the dean of students? There was considerable support for a role that (1) includes a primary commitment to students rather than to administrative tasks, (2) avoids conflict with students, and (3) permits him to help students, to be accessible to them, to be perceived as a counselor and an advocate for students. There was also considerable support for the position that the dean's own personal values, rather than the dictates of a president, should guide his behavior. On the other hand students, more often than other participants, express greater support for a dean's (1) commitment to "the students," and (2) his noninvolvement in control and discipline and value enforcement. Presidents consistently seem to attach more importance to administrative tasks, integration of counseling and discipline, and the upholding of institutional standards and values. These data indicate that deans function in the midst of widely conflicting expectations and, perhaps, provide a basis for understanding why deans experience role ambiguity, confusion, and sometimes conflict with members of the academic community.

*Perceptions of the Role and Responsibilities of the Dean of Students.<sup>3</sup>*

The presidents, faculty members and students were asked to indicate how they felt a dean of students would respond to each of the value and conviction statements on the questionnaire. Some very striking differences resulted between the dean's actual responses and the responses others thought he might make. Generally, the guesses of presidents were close to the actual responses of their deans. Students, on the other hand, frequently perceived the deans as individuals acting and feeling differently than is actually the case. For example, whereas between three-quarters and four-fifths of the deans, on various items, expressed a strong commitment to students, only about half the student respondents felt that the deans viewed this as a primary commitment. About three-quarters of the deans felt that their effectiveness was reduced by over-concern with control and order; only two-thirds of the students perceived that the dean would see it that way.

With reference to the items on standards of conduct and morals, most of the other respondents indicated that the dean would answer differently than he actually did. The greatest discrepancy between his actual response and any perceived response occurred among the students. For example, students perceived deans as being more concerned with upholding sensitive standards not specified in a code, with enforcement of moral standards, and with inculcation of institutional values than was actually indicated by the deans. Although 90 percent of the deans would not violate the confidentiality of a counseling relationship, only about 25 percent of the students indicated the same. In addition, about half the students felt that deans would agree with the statement that responsibility to the president should take precedence over their personal convictions; actually, only 25 percent of the deans held such a view.

In great contrast to the dean's actual views, then, students saw deans as less concerned with the welfare of students; less willing to engage in conflict with them; less inclined to disassociate themselves with unpopular decisions; less concerned that their effectiveness would be reduced by over-concern with control and order, and less inclined to place personal convictions above responsibility to the president than the deans saw themselves. They also felt that deans would be more concerned with upholding conduct standards and moral values and were more inclined to violate the confidentiality of a counseling situation than was actually the case.

*Preferred Role of the Dean of Students in Policy Formulation.* The respondents were also asked to indicate what role they felt the dean should play in policy development. As noted in Table 10, the majority

<sup>3</sup>See Tables 6 and 8, Items 1-9, 18, 22 and 23.

of deans felt that they should determine policy in consultation with students and faculty; and nearly 40 percent supported the view that they should participate in policy formulation as a voting member of a campus governance group. They favored neither a purely advisory nor an authoritarian, unilateral decision-making role. Generally, presidents and faculty agreed with the deans' position. Students felt, however, that deans should simply provide advice or participate along with other members of the community in any decision-making process. They clearly supported a reduction in the authority of the dean in policy development.

*Evaluation of the Dean of Students' Performance.* Data were gathered on how the dean felt he was evaluated by his president and how the president actually assessed the dean's effectiveness. (See Table 11.)

In order of importance, the most significant criteria as viewed by the dean were: (a) relations with members of the academic community; (b) administrative competence and effectiveness, and (c) maintenance of control and order on the campus. The criteria cited most often by the presidents, also in order of importance, were: (a) relations with members of the academic community; (b) administrative competence and efficiency, and (c) contribution to student development and assessment of student needs.

The presidents placed more emphasis on relations with members of the community than the deans; the deans correctly perceived that their reputations in the academic community were most important to the president. In addition, more deans held the view that their ability to maintain control and order was far more important to the president than was actually the case. Few of the deans or presidents attached much importance to personal values and character.

It is interesting to note that the deans felt that relatively little importance was attached to such criteria as creative and innovative leadership, maintenance of campus morale, or contribution to students' development and assessment of their needs. These items were recorded infrequently by the presidents also. Can it be that many deans talk about the importance of these factors in their work when, in fact, neither they nor their presidents see them as very important evaluative criteria? Relationships with others, administrative competence and maintenance of control and order are viewed as more significant, according to the data.

Finally, nearly 10 percent of the deans had no idea of the criteria used to evaluate them, and about 5 percent of the presidents were not able to formulate the criteria they used in appraising the work of their deans. The deans' responses ranged from "I wish I knew," to "Lord only knows," to "I'll be damned if I can figure it out . . . but it's probably whether he likes me or not."

## **The Student and the Educational Process**

Several items were designed to provide some clue to the assumptions and beliefs of members of the academic community regarding the student and the educational process. More specifically the items related to these questions: (1) Is it assumed that social maturity and value development are necessary concerns of the institution? (2) What is assumed about control and regulation? (3) What is believed about the need to personalize the academic experience? (4) Is dissent a vehicle for learning? (5) Is the idea of conscious manipulation as a educational tool acceptable?

*Social Maturity and Value Development.*<sup>4</sup> With unusual consensus, the respondents believe that social maturity and value development should be integral parts of a student's education. Furthermore, presidents, deans, and faculty members feel that the institution, by its programs and procedures, should manifest concern for these considerations. Though somewhat less sure, the students tend also to agree. Strong disagreement, however, becomes evident over whether a dean should attempt to "influence" students to adopt values held to be important by the institution. Over 80 percent of the presidents and more than two-thirds of the faculty and deans support this tactic; 77 percent of the student respondents object to such attempts. On this point, students accurately perceive the dean's response; they may be expected to view as indoctrination any great effort on his part to "influence." Students do not believe the dean would agree that force and learning are largely contradictory.

Social maturity and value development are included by all groups as objectives integral to intellectual attainment and, therefore, legitimate institutional concerns. All agree that maturity is attained to the extent that students are free to make personal decisions. The students strongly object to attempts to influence them to adopt a particular set of values defined as important by the institution.

*Control and Regulation.*<sup>5</sup> In 1966, the deans who responded to the preliminary "assumptions and beliefs" study seemed very confused as to the essential purpose of regulations. In the present study, more than three-quarters of the deans and the other four groups registered the belief that the essential purpose of conduct regulations is simply to maintain reasonable control and order in the academic community.

<sup>4</sup>See Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8, Items 14, 15, 20 and 23.

<sup>5</sup>See Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8, Items 10, 12 and 13.

Deans who institute regulations "as a teaching tool" or "to prohibit behavior which interferes with student growth and development" will find that they are not a highly trafficked road. It seems that members of the academic community are giving less attention to regulations as an expression of a value system than was the case in 1966. Rules and regulations are more likely to be expedients and necessities than expressions of any such system. Only restraint essential to maintaining the community will likely be implemented.

Further, with regard to control and regulations, strong disagreement is noted in response to the proposition, "Since an academic institution is a community established for a specific purpose, the behavior of the members of that community must be restricted in special ways." Eighty-four percent of the presidents agree with this statement. The dean and faculty follow dutifully along but fewer than half the student respondents agreed. (The deans from church-related and independent institutions are more supportive of "special" restrictions than are the deans in public institutions.)

The extent to which external control is necessary is unclear from the results of this study. Do students develop better when freed from authority and, therefore, act (presumably) on the basis of personal judgments; or are they apprentices, not "full citizens," and in the institution precisely to be influenced and directed in their development? Heavy emphasis on external control and force in policy development seems inconsistent with accepted concepts of learning and student development. The question remains: "To what extent must institutional policies respect the necessity for student experimentation?"

*The Need to Personalize the Educational Experience.*<sup>6</sup> All the respondents agree, overwhelmingly, that an essential ingredient to personalization in higher education is provision for the privacy of the individual student; yet, only the president believes the dean is really concerned with this matter. The obvious question is, "What will be done, and by whom, to provide this privacy which the respondents acknowledge as so important?" Further in regard to personalization, the dean is more willing than members of the other four groups to allow that making exceptions to "policy" in the handling of specific student incidents will not constitute reinforcement of unacceptable behavior.

The deans have changed markedly on this issue since the 1966 study when their response to the same item was split almost evenly. Paradoxically, too, the dean appears (to the other four groups of re-

<sup>6</sup>See Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8, Items 16 and 21.

spondents and especially to students) to be much more rigid than he actually is in this matter. Only 37 percent of the student body presidents and 33 percent of the editors could fathom the deans agreeing with them that exceptions to policy in handling specific student incidents would not constitute reinforcement of unacceptable behavior. At the same time students' interest in the "individualized" handling of their behavior does not detract from a concomitant concern that procedural safeguards (for them) be more elaborate and formalized than a simple expression of "respect for the rights and dignity of the individual." One gets the impression that students very much want individual and personal relationships, but within clearly established guidelines of procedural due process. To honor both concerns can be difficult.

*Dissent as a Vehicle for Learning.*<sup>7</sup> Questioning and dissent seem to lie at the very heart of the educational process. Because some student activists have carried the matter to such extremes, it may be surprising to note that 88 percent of the deans of students agree that the present climate of dissent, though unfortunate in some instances, represents a significant positive development in higher education. (New England deans support this proposition most strongly; Southern deans support it less.) The students agree, with the concurrence of 76 percent of the presidents and 75 percent of the faculty members. The others, especially the students, do not believe the dean values such dissent.

*Manipulation of the Environment.*<sup>8</sup> "Manipulation" as an educational tool is not as poorly received as might be assumed. Some educators would argue that since manipulation occurs continuously anyway, it would be best if it were to occur consciously and by pre-determined plan. Eighty-five percent of the deans, the others somewhat less emphatically, agree that the deans should consciously manipulate certain aspects of the institutional environment in ways which support or promote development of the individual student. The results of this study do not provide the clues as to how, or with regard to what issues, this is done.

All agree, however, the students most emphatically, that such manipulation should not include attempts by the dean to protect the student from defeats which the dean believes might actually promote student growth. There is a good deal of support for this position, of course. Heath, who developed a model of the education man, whom he chooses to call *The Reasonable Adventurer*, indicates that "some

<sup>7</sup>See Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8, Item 27.

<sup>8</sup>See Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8, Items 17 and 18.



students must go down before they are able to go up.”<sup>9</sup> In *How Children Fail*, Holt emphasizes that one of the essential ingredients in student growth is the need to see failure as honorable and constructive.<sup>10</sup> Gardner, in *Self-Renewal*, clearly establishes the fear of failure as a powerful obstacle to growth. “There is no learning without some difficulty and fumbling. If you want to keep on learning, you must keep on risking failure.”<sup>11</sup> It is interesting that in the 1966 study to which reference is made above, 71 percent of the deans agreed that there is no meaningful success unless the student has freedom to fail. Today, deans seem even less concerned about protecting students from defeating experiences.

*Summary.* It may be stated that social maturity and value development are believed by the respondents to be important dimensions of the institutional mission and integral to students’ intellectual attainment. Yet, students strongly object to attempts to influence them to adopt a particular set of values defined as important by the institution. They prefer to emphasize the need for personal freedom to decide. A degree of privacy is called for, and individual consideration in making exceptions to the handling of student predicaments is not believed to reinforce mistakes. Dissent is understood as basic to the educational process. Regulations are necessary simply to maintain control and order, rather than as expressions of any value systems.

It is important to emphasize, too, that the students seem to see the dean in a way very different from the way he sees himself. The student believes that the dean will be negative about the present climate of dissent; that he will not be especially concerned for students’ privacy or freedom of choice; that he is less committed to the students than he says he is. In only two of the 15 items relating to the student and the educational process did students accurately perceive the assumptions and beliefs registered by the dean.

<sup>9</sup>Roy Heath, *The Reasonable Adventurer* (Pittsburgh: The University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964), p. 63.

<sup>10</sup>John Holt, *How Children Fail* (New York: Dell Publishing Company, Inc., 1964).

<sup>11</sup>John Gardner, *Self-Renewal* (New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1963), p. 15.

## Campus Governance and Decision Making

The degree to which various sectors of the academic community are included in campus governance and decision-making is of particular importance to all institutions of higher education. Faculty, students, and administrators are seeking greater voice in campus issues, and this is particularly true in areas where they have not, traditionally, been involved. Students today, for example, seek a voice in decisions pertaining to academic matters, an area traditionally controlled by faculty; some faculty seem to wish a stronger role in total institutional governance, controlled heretofore on many campuses by top level administrative personnel. As a result of increased demands for participation, responsible administrators are being forced to re-think local processes of campus governance and decision-making and to respond in a manner consistent with the best interests of the institution.

This portion of the study was particularly concerned, then, with the dean's assumptions and beliefs about campus governance and decision-making, the comparable assumptions and beliefs of others within the community, and relevant perceptual information.

*Reasons for Student Involvement in Governance and Decision-Making.* It is apparent that contemporary students are very much concerned about the role they should play in institutional governance and decision-making. (See Table 12.) Increased student activism and unrest can frequently be attributed to students' need for a greater voice in critical campus issues. One way institutions seem to be responding is by appointing increasing numbers of students to important campus committees. One of the unresolved questions, however, seems to be the "why" of student involvement: Is it only because of increased student pressures — or do colleges and universities really now, believe that students can contribute positively to the decision-making process?

It is clear from the results of the study that deans of students strongly support student involvement, not just because it has recently become the accepted thing to do, but because they feel that students are ready for this experience and that involving them results in more insightful decisions.<sup>12</sup> Editors and student presidents agreed with deans; faculty and presidents, however, were much less convinced of students' maturity and ability to participate in decision-making and campus governance. Faculty, moreover, were more inclined to believe

<sup>12</sup>See Tables 5 and 7, Item 26.

that student participation is good for their personal development, but of no particular value to the institution — and in so believing probably illustrate again their traditional view of students as apprentices, rather than “junior partners of the firm.” It is interesting to note, too, that very little support was offered by any of the five respondents for “involving” students because to do so might lessen the possibility of student/administration conflict.

*Perceptions of the Dean of Students’ Response Regarding Student Participation in Governance and Decision-Making.*<sup>18</sup> It is clear from analysis of the perception data that presidents were able to perceive quite accurately how a dean views the students’ ability to participate in policy decisions. Faculty members’ perceptions were not nearly as consistent with the deans’ actual responses. Students, unfortunately, tended to misperceive even more the beliefs of the dean. Whereas deans strongly agreed that students are sufficiently mature for participation in top level decision-making, 46 percent of the student presidents and 60 percent of the student editors participating in the study felt that the deans would not feel that students were sufficiently mature to participate in top level policy decisions. Such misperception draws attention to a recurring theme of this research: Student unawareness of how deans feel about crucial issues.

In a second examination of the perception data, actual responses of presidents, faculty members, and students’ were compared with their own perceptions of how the dean might respond to the same statement. The analysis revealed the degree to which members of the community feel that their beliefs are compatible with the benefits of the dean of students. Again, deans and presidents tended to be more in agreement with presidents’ actual responses closely paralleling their perceptions of how deans would respond. Students and faculty members, on the other hand, clearly do not perceive that their responses to crucial issues run parallel to the deans’.

*To What Degree Should Faculty, Administrators and Students Be Involved in Governance and Decision-Making?* The participants were asked to indicate who should be involved in decisions pertaining to (1) academic matters, (2) employment and retention of faculty and staff, (3) budgetary matters, (4) parietal rules, (5) student activity matters, and (6) adjudication of student conduct. (See Table 13.)

(1) *Academic Matters.* The academic program has, traditionally, been one of the least acceptable, least “legitimate” areas within the academic community for genuine student involvement. On most camp-

<sup>18</sup>See Tables 6 and 8, Item 26.

uses, it has remained within the sole province of the faculty. Accordingly, faculty members tended to express strong views about their role and the role of others in academic affairs.

As might be expected, the presidents and faculty members strongly supported the notion that faculty be the ones primarily involved in all decisions pertaining to academic matters. Some tendency was found for the inclusion of student and administrative personnel in matters dealing with curriculum design, particularly among the deans of students. It is interesting that less enthusiasm was shown for joint faculty-student-administration involvement in decisions affecting academic standing and grading practices. Conversely, deans of students' support for "primarily faculty" involvement increased from 20 percent on the item "Curriculum Design" to 32 percent on "Grading Practices" to 33 percent on "Academic Standing." And as might, perhaps, be expected, students supported joint involvement — of students, faculty, and administrators — in *all* decisions affecting the academic program.

(2) *Employment and Retention of Faculty and Staff.* Deans of students, presidents, and faculty were very little inclined toward including students in decisions pertaining to the employment and retention of faculty and staff. Deans, however, were more willing than the other two to let students join with them in making such decisions. The deans' position on this item was more consistent with student views. Presidents and faculty opted for "faculty-administrative with *no* student" involvement.

(3) *Institutional Budgetary Matters.* Budgetary matters attracted no support for "only student" involvement, and little enthusiasm for "joint academic community" participation. All five groups agreed that such things should be handled primarily by administrative personnel. Deans, however, did join with student respondents in providing measurable support for at least *some* student involvement in money matters. Faculty and presidents, on the other hand, very strongly agreed with the notion that *no* students should participate in decisions pertaining to institutional budgets.

(4) *Parietal Rules.* With respect to decisions on women's hours, visitation regulations, and use of alcoholic beverages, deans, presidents, and faculty supported "joint faculty, administrative, and student" participation. The deans gave strong emphasis to "primarily student" involvement in decisions pertaining to women's hours and visitation privileges. In a reversal of their feelings about participation in decisions affecting academic matters, the deans gave little endorsement for "primarily faculty" participation in *all* decisions pertaining to parietal rules and regulations.

Women's hours and visitation regulations were selected by the students, of course, as areas for "primarily student" participation. Students did tend to agree with presidents, faculty members, and deans of students that decisions having to do with the use of alcoholic beverages should be joint "faculty-student-administrative" decisions. It is interesting to note that in the area of parietal rules, use of alcoholic beverages tended to be considered by all five groups as a rather problematic area. Deans, presidents, and faculty, while desiring joint decision-making in matters pertaining to women's hours and visitation regulations in residence halls, were not nearly as certain that students should be included in decisions having to do with use of alcoholic beverages.

(5) *Student Activity Matters.* Near unanimity of response marked the questions on student activity matters. All groups felt that in decisions pertaining to allocation of student activities fees, student government, and student publications, students should have the primary voice. Though not noted in the published table, in the area of student publications (as contrasted with other areas of student activities), the faculty and administrators also gave important attention to "joint faculty, administrative, and student" involvement. This support was particularly strong on the part of presidents. They seem to be giving more attention to a need for an "adult" voice in working through the problems of the student press.

(6) *Adjudication of Student Misconduct.* Student conduct — both social and academic — was felt by the deans, faculty, and presidents to be an area appropriate for equal participation by faculty, administrators, and students in decision-making. The students, however, indicated that "only students" should be involved in adjudication of their own social misconduct. The first choice of all in cases of alleged academic dishonesty was for joint community involvement. Interestingly, deans, presidents, and faculty members all gave some support to "primarily student" responsibility for the adjudication of students' social conduct, but they preferred "no student" involvement in academic dishonesty cases.

*Summary.* The results of the study indicate that the dean of students is in the vanguard of support for decision-making processes which would, in some way, involve students. Moreover, the deans believe that students possess the maturity to contribute to the probability of more insightful decisions. Even the deans, though, in expression of their strong sentiments for a greater student voice in institutional affairs, are not unequivocal in fully supporting student involvement in areas which have, by tradition, been reserved for other groups within the institution and/or where information has not generally been of a "public" nature. Specifically, this includes academic matters, institu-

tional financial affairs, and faculty retention and selection. Deans and all others endorse "primarily student" involvement in decisions relating to the student activity area.

It is clear that anything touching the academic area raises doubts in the minds of all five groups as to whether students should have a significant voice. This has been one of the most difficult areas within higher education for faculty and administrators to accept as a legitimate student concern. Although indicating a need for token student involvement, particularly with respect to curriculum design, even chief student personnel administrators highly endorse faculty and administrative control of matters pertaining to academic affairs.

Presidents and faculty members, although tending to be consistent with the responses by deans of students, deviated in their degree of support for student involvement, particularly as it pertained to academic matters and employment and retention of faculty and staff. Presidents and faculty members seemed more inclined toward "no student" involvement in these areas. All five groups in the study, however, were unanimous in feeling that students should be the primary participants in all decisions pertaining to student activities. Interestingly, faculty were more strongly inclined toward believing that student participation is good for their personal development and less supportive of their participation being of value to the institution. Faculty, as a result, tend to support the traditional view of students as apprentices rather than partners in the educational enterprise.

Student presidents and editors tended to be more supportive of student participation, particularly in academic matters and the employment and retention of faculty and staff, than is evident from the responses by the other three groups. Students, of course, strongly supported the notion that they be an active part of all university decision-making and governance and opted for at least some involvement in all institutional decision-making.

The deans of students tend to move on a middle path, between students and presidents/faculty. It is apparent that they see themselves championing the importance of at least some student involvement in essentially all institutional decision-making and governance. It is also clear that deans see their own role in decision-making in student affairs as part of a joint process, with others sharing in final decisions in either consultative or full voting capacity. It is apparent that the dean does not prefer unilateral decision-making status, nor does he prefer to serve in an "advise — but don't vote" capacity. In other words, deans of students support greater freedom for students and advocate greater concern for student needs — including a more significant role in institutional decision-making — than is now



the case; but at the same time, they would reserve to themselves a role in decision-making in student affairs that is in many respects "no less equal" than others.

## **Summary, Implications, and Personal Observations**

*Summary.* On the basis of his responses to items on the questionnaire, what can be said about the dominant orientations, the "character," of the American Dean of Students as he stands at the threshold of the 1970s?

He expresses a strong commitment to students and their welfare. He feels that social maturity and value development are institutional concerns integral to intellectual attainment. He supports allowing students freedom to develop their abilities, to make decisions, and to exercise their rights. He also feels that the counseling relationship should be confidential, that provision for privacy is important, that students have the maturity to participate in policy formulation, and that they should have a more significant role in institutional decision-making. Clearly, he expresses concern for the student and his development through provision for freedom to test and to experiment.

Although the deans indicate that regulation of conduct is necessary and that counseling and discipline are interrelated functions, they are also sensitive to the implications of control as a potential deterrent to their effectiveness, to the need to protect the individual through due process, to the need to make exceptions to policy when in the best interest of the student, and to the importance of dissent in the academic community. In other words, they are quite aware of the "human side" of control and order.

Yet, there is evidence of uncertainty regarding their role with reference to the upholding of unspecified, sensitive standards, enforcement of moral standards, and inculcation of institutional values. There was substantial division among them over these items.

In terms of personal "style," the deans feel that they should enter into conflict with students when necessary. They also indicate that they should not disassociate themselves from unpopular institutional decisions; but they state that their responsibility to the president should not take precedence over their own personal convictions.

Concern is expressed by deans of students that at least some student involvement should occur in essentially all areas of institutional decision-making and governance. However, they are more certain that students should be represented in decisions pertaining to parietal rules, student activity matters, and the adjudication of student conduct than

they are in decisions having to do with academic and financial matters and faculty selection and retention. Deans see their own role in decision-making in the area of student affairs as part of a joint process.

Generally, the presidents' responses were quite similar to those of the deans. The president, however, is less inclined to hold that the dean's primary commitment should be to the student. Moreover, he is less supportive of student involvement in all areas of decision-making and governance. He more frequently indicates that the dean should be involved in enforcement of moral standards and that exceptions to policy do reinforce unacceptable behavior.

Although some differences existed between the deans and faculty, they were more alike than dissimilar in assumptions and beliefs. The only striking difference between the responses is with reference to the item on student participation in policy development. More faculty feel that students lack the background for such participation than is true among the deans. Faculty, in addition, were less inclined to include students, or for that matter administrators, in academic decisions.

The student respondents feel that the dean should have a primary commitment to students; that he should engage in conflict with students when he disagrees with them; that he should disassociate himself from unpopular decisions; that his effectiveness is reduced by over-concern with control; that he should not be concerned with enforcement of moral standards; that he must not attempt to protect students from defeats; that he should deliberately manipulate the environment to promote student development (but that his attempts to influence student value development is questionable behavior); that he should not violate the confidentiality of a counseling relationship, and that his personal convictions should take precedence over the wishes of the president. The students also indicate that conduct regulation seems designed to do more than prohibit behavior that interferes with student growth; that social maturity and value development are and should be institutional concerns; that exceptions to policy will not reinforce unacceptable behavior; that over-delegation is more desirable than under-delegation; that maturity is attained through freedom to make decisions and exercise rights; that students have sufficient maturity to participate in policy development; and that present dissent is a positive development.

More typically than other participants, students hold views that are divergent from those of the deans. On the whole, the variation is not striking. Yet, some important differences seem to be a matter of emphasis. The students, for example, do not support *as strongly* as the deans the view that counseling and discipline should be related functions residing in the same person — the dean; or that on-campus

behavior must be restricted in any "special" ways; or that over-delegation of responsibility to students is more desirable than under-delegation; or that the dean's attempt to influence value development is questionable behavior. Other differences between the two groups are less marked.

The striking difference between the deans on the one hand, and faculty and students on the other, occurs over the perception — or misperception — of the assumptions and beliefs of that central figure: The Dean of Students. With minor exceptions the presidents' perceptions of how deans would respond to certain items were quite close to the actual answers of the deans. But the faculty perception data, although it does not show consistently sharp divergence from the stated positions of the deans, reveals some divergence worthy of comment. Faculty members, for example, seem to think that deans are *less inclined than they actually are to*:

- (1) engage in conflict with students;
- (2) view the interposition of large staffs between the dean and students as a contribution to depersonalization;
- (3) feel that attempts to protect students from defeat hinders growth;
- (4) prefer over-delegation of responsibility to students, and
- (5) support the view that dissent in higher education has been a positive force.

Conversely, faculty members seem to feel that deans would be *more supportive than they actually are of*:

- (1) upholding of unspecified but sensitive standards;
- (2) disassociation from unpopular administrative decisions;
- (3) the enforcement of moral standards, and
- (4) the view that policy exceptions tend to reinforce unacceptable behavior.

It is the students' guesses as to how deans would respond to the assumptions and beliefs items that most often contrast with the positions actually taken by the deans. The students saw deans as *less inclined than they actually are to*:

- (1) be concerned with student welfare;
- (2) feel that effectiveness is reduced by over-concern with control and order;
- (3) see interposition of staffs between themselves and students as a cause of depersonalization;
- (4) view protective actions toward students as a hindrance to their own growth;
- (5) support over-delegation of responsibility to students;

- (6) hold that confidentiality of the counseling relationship should not be violated;
- (7) see present dissent as a positive development, and
- (8) feel that students are sufficiently mature to participate in top level decision-making.

On the other hand, the student respondents felt *to a greater degree than was actually true* that the dean would tend to:

- (1) permit his responsibilities to the president to prevail over personal convictions;
- (2) feel that he should uphold unspecified conduct standards;
- (3) prefer to play a role involving enforcement of moral standards;
- (4) view conduct regulation as a means of maintaining control and order;
- (5) see exceptions to the rule as reinforcing unacceptable behavior, and
- (6) feel that students lack the maturity to participate in policy development.

What are the causes of the disparity between the deans' actual responses and students' perceptions of them? Why, for example, do students see the dean as less concerned for their welfare and more control-oriented than he reports he is? Is it because the dean is not telling the truth? Because he is misperceiving his own role — or because, in fact, there are dimensions to the role that in the minds of students tend to blot out, or blur, the positive contributions that the dean makes? If certain aspects of the dean's job generate negative perceptions, should these aspects be eliminated or changed in such a way as to stimulate more positive perceptions? Or, given that the dean is involved in control and discipline, should he simply accept the fact that a certain degree of negative perception will always be generated and live with it?

The deans felt that the criteria used by their presidents to evaluate them were: (1) effectiveness of their relations with members of the academic community; (2) administrative competence and effectiveness; (3) maintenance of control and order. The presidents also cited, most frequently, relations with the academic community and administrative skills; but third most often cited the dean's contribution to student development and his ability to assess student needs. Thus, the deans considered their abilities to maintain control and order as more important to the president than it actually seems to be. Moreover they — the deans — felt that little significance is attached to creative and innovative leadership on their part, to the maintenance of campus morale and their contributions to students' development. The presidents also gave little support to the leadership and morale criteria.

## Implications and Observations

If students feel, as the data indicate, that the dean is more concerned with control and order, protection of campus standards and values, curtailment of freedom, trusting students less, and making less of a personal commitment to their welfare than the students would prefer, can that dean be a positive model and source of inspiration and help in students' lives? If the answer is "No," then the obvious question is, "How can a dean's role be modified so that he exerts a positive influence on students?"

*Share Responsibility.* As a beginning, his role should be redefined so that he alone is not The Protector of Campus Morals and Upholder of Institutional Values. If the institution feels that certain standards and values are important, their maintenance should be a shared community responsibility. It seems obvious that the dean cannot really be neutral on matters of concern to the institution, that he must support institutional expectations, values, and objectives — but that he should not be the only one concerned with these matters. Too often, deans either have blindly accepted the role of enforcer of values and standards or have had the role thrust upon them by the president or an academic community that has long since abdicated its responsibility in this area.

It is probably true, and to be acknowledged, that many deans of students in fact, because of basic personality characteristics, consciously or unconsciously seek authoritarian, power-oriented roles. Yet, the data on the kind of role they would prefer to play in policy development — results of this and past research — indicate that most deans do not favor authoritarian job definitions.<sup>14</sup> They seem to desire job descriptions that will permit them to influence policy development, but not dominate it; be accessible to students; be free to help students make decisions and work for their welfare.

*Rethink Role.* How can the dean break out of the traditional control-oriented role and become freer to assist students in their development? How can the dean's role be restructured in such a way as to permit him to reinforce institutional standards, values, and objectives, and yet be regarded by students as a source of counsel and as an important model in their own quest to develop their talents, refine their values and attitudes? First, he must press for community sup-

<sup>14</sup>Thomas B. Dutton, Fred W. Smith, and Thomas Zarle, *Institutional Approaches to the Adjudication of Student Misconduct*, NASPA, 1969, p. 25.

port of institutional values and expectations, for participation by members of the academic community in decision-making, and in adjudication of conduct cases. There is no doubt that under such arrangements the dean would have less formalized power and authority and that his effectiveness would depend more upon his intellectual capacities and personal skills. Certainly, he would be *forced* to acquire knowledge of the environmental factors that impinge upon his students, as well as of knowledge of student motivations, abilities, limitations, needs, and attitudes. He would be well-advised to know a good deal about the behavioral sciences and learning theory.

He would also need to equip himself to function as a *change agent* who can create and adjust environmental conditions to achieve desired behavioral changes in students. To move successfully from controller-and-enforcer to leader-and-influencer-of-change, he would need to become an expert in human development; an educator whose special insights, knowledge, and skills permit him to contribute in fundamental and unique ways to the development of students and to the attainment of institutional goals. He must also possess the ability to adjust, to change. This will require openness to new ideas and approaches and the capacity to incorporate new experiences into old approaches.

He must also carefully examine his daily activities and eliminate those details that interfere with a leadership/student development role. If he is bogged down with administrative trivia and control functions, can he really expect others to perceive him as an educator — or expect the president to measure him against evaluative criteria that emphasize creative leadership, innovation, and one's contribution to the learning process? There is little doubt that in some instances, presidents and the academic community can impose a role on the dean that is distasteful and that may make it difficult for him to be perceived as an expert in learning. But the questions bear repeating: Is the dean too accepting? Unwilling or incapable of demanding roles that square with his aspirations and principles? Evaluative criteria and role expectations will not change in a more positive direction until the dean can demonstrate that he knows what he wants and how to accomplish it.

*Clarify Own Values.* The dean of students must reappraise his convictions in light of the somewhat changed context within which he functions. He must know at what point to separate personal from institutional values. One may disagree with an "institutional" stance on a given issue; but as long as one can follow his own rules of life and tolerate the inconsistencies between his values and those of the academic community, he should be able to function reasonably well. Operationally, he should be able to reflect his convictions in his work.



but he should be careful to differentiate between influence and force. Influence and example may prove to be more effective devices if one knows what he stands for and behaves accordingly.

Many deans seem not to have a clear conception of their values. Others may understand what they believe, but they fail to espouse vigorously their values out of fear of straining relationships. In a quest to establish rapport with students and faculty, it is quite possible to hide one's convictions; but is this not a great disservice to one's self, and thus, by extension, to students and the total academic community?

What should be the response of the dean when he is confronted with an important value judgment? First, he must examine his personal values and convictions and the values and objectives of the academic community. Secondly, he must move to a decision based on the results of his examination. Two factors seem important in making such judgment: (1) What course of action is most conducive to student development and the realization of institutional objectives? (2) What approach is most consistent with one's own values and convictions? Having decided where he stands on an issue, he must feed this viewpoint into the decision-making process and actively seek an outcome that has educational merit.

This process of examination and decision-making is not an easy one because it requires hard work, openness, and the courage to act in accordance with one's values. When confronted with a difficult value choice on an issue, it is easy to acquiesce, to reduce pressure. It is only human to try to avoid painful encounters by rationalizing a change in which one does not believe. But it must be answered: Does this change make sense educationally; does it conflict in a critical way with my own values?

A case in point is the current demand of students for more freedom in residence halls — freedom to make their own decisions regarding visitation in student rooms, behavioral expectations, and other matters. If an institution accepts student self-determination on this particular matter, why does it do so? Is the acceptance based on a desire to avoid student confrontation or on a conclusion that this kind of self-determination contributes to the learning process? As dean of students, does one habitually press for evidence that an action has educational merit? Does one seriously attempt to clarify the implications of an action as they relate to his own values and convictions?

As parietal rules are eliminated and students have more opportunity for freedom of choice, both on a group and an individual basis, an important question becomes: What should be the role of the institution in helping students gain the insights necessary to be self-directing in the creative, positive, and nondestructive sense? What

models and alternative value positions should be presented to students as they exercise the right of free choice? It is obvious that institutions have granted greater freedom to students, but it seems that too few institutions have helped students to understand the implications of their freedom and how they might use it to greatest advantage in the long run.

The same criticism can be leveled at deans of students. If deans can overcome their own uneasiness about increased freedoms in conflict with their personal values, perhaps they can then take better advantage of their opportunity to help students make wise decisions. As parietal rules vanish, it is not possible to hide behind any manuel of restrictive regulations. The dean in particular must be able to relate directly to students and to help them think through judgments crucially affecting their lives. If he is to be effective in this process, he will be a dean filled with new insights and expertise.

*Freedom vs. Restraint.* The data gathered in the present study indicate that deans favor more freedom for students; but, are they willing and able to operate from this position in the decision-making process? Or do external pressures and personal value orientations make it difficult for deans to behave in a manner consistent with their beliefs?

Deans must give careful thought to their position on freedom and restraint in learning, since these factors lie increasingly at the center of conflict between students and the administration. They should work to clarify, in their own minds, student relationships and student rights, freedoms and responsibilities, and how these factors relate to the learning process. It is also important to determine precisely how one views The Student. Does one see him as a learner-apprentice or as partner in the learning process? What environmental factors should be maintained to facilitate the development of the student? What tacks can the dean take to "maximize student learning"?

The writers feel that although in many ways the student can learn independently and contribute to the academic community, he must function in an institutional context — which means with faculty influence. Within academic and social boundaries, however, there should be maximum opportunity to discover, to question, and to experiment. This seems to be the best way to generate forces within the student that will permit him to develop his talents to the fullest and to function with independence and creativity. "If the student's incentive comes mainly from forces within himself, his desire to learn will increase with time, rather than diminish."<sup>15</sup>

It is interesting to note that real commitment to student experi-

<sup>15</sup>Joseph Katz and Associates, *No Time for Youth* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968), p. 438.

mentation and self-direction was not reflected in a substantial number of institutional policies on the 18 issues examined in research on "Institutional Policies on Controversial Topics" conducted by the NASPA Division of Research and Program Development in 1966.

. . . there was considerable emphasis, in both the policy statements and the purposes that underlie them, on control of student behavior and maintenance of standards of conduct. It seemed that there was a tendency to establish policy from the vantage point of institutional welfare, rather than student welfare.<sup>16</sup>

Such emphasis on external control and force in policy development as was brought to light in the "controversial issues" research seems inconsistent with sound learning theory. Can there, with such a commitment to restraint, be established and maintained a viable community of learning?

Freedom does not mean, of course, that standards, requirements, and limits should be cast aside. Reasonable restraint is essential if the academic community is to retain cohesion and vitality, and if the individual student is to avoid destructive experiences. But control and freedom must somehow be more effectively balanced in the curriculum and in the student's personal life so that his developmental needs are met and the integrity of the institution is maintained. This balance is very difficult to achieve, and once achieved, the academic community must constantly work to maintain it. Perhaps the best approach is to start from the position that protection of individual freedom is primary, and that if one errs in balancing individual against institutional needs, it is better to err in the direction of the individual. With such an emphasis on individual welfare, it seems more likely that student self-control and self-direction will be stimulated, permitting greater growth within a framework of social responsibility. The successful implementation of this complex balancing process requires courage to press vigorously for those definitions of student/institutional relationships that are most consistent with learning theory, student development needs, and institutional objectives.

The data in the present study indicate that the participants are concerned for the welfare of both the academic community and the individual, but that protection of the individual and extension of his opportunities for development seem to take precedence over community needs. For example, although there is substantial agreement that conduct standards and regulations are necessary and that social maturity is an important objective, strong concern was also expressed

<sup>16</sup>Thomas B. Dutton, James R. Appleton and Fred W. Smith, *Institutional Policies on Controversial Topics*, NASPA, 1968, p. 65.

for the welfare of the individual and for granting him freedom to experience defeat, to make personal decisions, and to exercise citizenship rights and responsibilities. Moreover, the data indicate that the respondents want the dean's role to be constructed in a manner permitting him to help students exercise increased freedom. Students felt that he should make a primary and fundamental commitment to them, that he should not be overly involved in control and order, and that he should not attempt inculcation of institutional values. All seem to feel that the dean could be more effective in assisting students to use their freedom constructively if he were not burdened with the traditional control and limit-setting function.

And if the dean does not perform this restrictive function, who will? Certainly, it might be possible to shift responsibility for adjudication of conduct cases to a discipline committee or to an administrative office concerned directly with campus conduct matters yet, does either of these models enable the dean to contribute more effectively to student behavioral change?

*Community Involvement.* This study was based on the premise that a fundamental cause of conflict is various individuals' and sub-groups' tendency to take different positions on crucial issues. How does an institution cope with such diversity of viewpoint and continue to operate with reasonable effectiveness? The answer seems to involve strong efforts to establish decision-making processes based on wide representation of the academic community. More opportunities must be created for students, faculty, and staff to debate issues and alternatives and to exchange views. If the administration is conservative and unresponsive to change, such an approach would seem threatening and revolutionary; but in the long run, community resolution of issues can lead to more productive outcomes. Active involvement of members of the academic community cannot only improve decisions and reduce destructive conflict, it can also boost campus morale and increase confidence and trust among its many subcultures.

To achieve effective campus governance, an institution must come to grips with the basic reasons for involving students in decision-making and with perceptions of students' ability to contribute in important ways to the process of governance. The present study indicated that there is significant variation in the reasons for including students in policy development. Only 39 percent of the faculty and 45 percent of the presidents saw contribution to better decisions as the primary reason for student participation; the faculty and presidents gave greater support to the learning value of involvement. On the other hand, about two-thirds of the students felt that students should be involved because they could add important insights to campus judgments.

Moreover, the study showed important differences among the respondents with reference to the degree of involvement of various members of the academic community in specific areas of decision-making. For example, students felt that they should have a major part in the development of academic policy and parietal rules whereas the faculty and administrators did not feel that students should have such a role.

When there are conflicting views regarding the values and degree of student involvement, it should not be surprising that students on the one hand and faculty and administrators on the other have difficulty seeing eye to eye on the means of governance. In part, conflict over governance stems from the institution's view of the student. Is he seen as a mature, responsible person with the ability to participate on equal terms with others or as a learner who is in the process of developing and growing in capacity to make wise judgments? The latter view would seem to be the most prevalent position today. As long as this conception is held, governance will be a source of tension in higher education. But, in the face of such tension, should an institution attempt to create a model of governance in which students play an equal or significant role with faculty and staff in a substantial number of important decision-making areas? Would it be of benefit to the institution and the student to move in this direction? Would it strengthen the learning process and the quality of policy development and human interaction? Responses to such questions should help institutions to clarify the conceptual bases of governance and to evolve structures that are more consistent with educational philosophy and objectives.

It must be pointed out that within the current legal structure of higher education, there are real limitations to the evolvment of more democractic patterns of policy development because a power of review and veto always resides in a governing board. Yet, it should be possible to reach agreements with boards that give primary responsibility for certain functions to community governing bodies. The details of such agreements must be worked out over time and adjusted as conditions change. In addition, the degree to which boards delegate authority will depend on the character of each institution. Obviously, some schools — because of size, educational philosophy, and other factors — will be able to achieve a high degree of delegation, while others will be more restrictive. Some will achieve sophisticated community governments; others will retain stronger central administration, based on consultative mechanisms and arrangements that make the administration accountable to the academic community and to the board for decisions and actions. But regardless of the pattern of administration, there must be more active participation of com-

munity members in the direction and operation of the institution. Without it, the institution is destined to experience open and potentially damaging conflict, reduction in morale, or decreased educational quality over time — or all three.

# **Appendix A**

## **Questionnaires Used in the Study**





NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS  
Division of Research and Publications  
AN INVESTIGATION OF ASSUMPTIONS AND BELIEFS OF  
SELECTED MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY  
FORM A

The purpose of this study is to gather data on basic assumptions and beliefs of selected members of the academic community regarding significant issues and concerns in higher education. The data collected should help institutions gain greater understanding of some of the sources of conflict and differences in position among members of the academic community, and how colleges and universities might respond more effectively to campus problems and strengthen their contributions to student development.

An important dimension of the study focuses on perceptions held by members of the academic community concerning the chief student personnel officer's role and functions, and his assumptions and educational orientation. It is hoped that information of this type will offer a point of reference for institutions as well as student personnel administrators in evaluating the activities and practices of student personnel administrators, how they respond to campus issues and how they might more effectively participate in the learning process.

So that respondents may feel free to be frank in their expressions, be assured that you will remain *anonymous*.

When you have completed the instrument, please return it to Dr. Thomas B. Dutton, Director, NASPA Division of Research and Publications, 202 Wilson Hall, Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan.

In view of the importance of the data to institutions and to student personnel administrators, your cooperation in providing the information requested would be greatly appreciated.

1. Title of person completing this questionnaire. \_\_\_\_\_
2. Type of institution:
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Public Liberal Arts College
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Public University
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Independent Liberal Arts College
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Independent University
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Catholic Institution
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Protestant Institution
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Teachers College
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Technical Institution
3. Total Enrollment:
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Less than 1,500
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 1,500 to 5,000
  - \_\_\_\_\_ 5,000 to 10,000
  - \_\_\_\_\_ More than 10,000
4. Regional Accrediting Association:
  - \_\_\_\_\_ New England or Middle Atlantic
  - \_\_\_\_\_ North Central
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Southern
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Western or Northwestern

**DIRECTIONS:**

Please respond to each statement by placing an (X) in the appropriate box denoting whether you agree or disagree with the statement. You should respond from the perspective of how you personally feel about the statement.

**INDICATE HOW YOU PERSONALLY FEEL ABOUT THE STATEMENT.\***

1. The dean of student's availability and personal relationships with students should consistently take priority over the performance of administrative tasks. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
2. Basically, counseling and discipline are interrelated responsibilities of the dean of students and serve the same ends. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
3. The dean of student's primary commitment should be to the individual needs of the student. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
4. The dean of student's responsibilities to the president should consistently take precedence over his personal convictions. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
5. The dean of students is responsible for upholding certain standards which because of their sensitive nature cannot be stated in a specific code of regulations. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
6. Even at the risk of jeopardizing his rapport with students, the dean of students must be willing to engage in direct and open conflict with them if he disagrees with their position on an issue. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
7. In the interest of enabling students to feel that they have a "friend in court," it is important for the dean of students to disassociate himself from unpopular decisions made by the president, business manager, or academic dean. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
8. The dean of student's effectiveness is reduced by over concern with the maintenance of control and order. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
9. In much of what he does, the dean of students should be concerned with the enforcement of moral standards. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
10. The essential purpose of conduct regulations is to maintain reasonable control and order in the academic community. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
11. A significant aspect of depersonalization in higher education is the tendency of the dean of students to allow and to encourage the inserting of more "professional staff" between himself and students. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
12. The only justification for student conduct regulation is that it prohibits behavior which interferes with student growth and development. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
13. Since an academic institution is a community established for a specific purpose the behavior of the members of that community must be restricted in special ways. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
14. The institution should be concerned with the social maturity and value development of the individual student. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
15. Social maturity and value development are integral to the student's intellectual attainment. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
16. Exceptions to policy in the handling of specific student incidents are likely to constitute the reinforcement of unacceptable behavior. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
17. Attempts by the dean of students to protect the student from "defeating experience" may actually hinder student growth. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
18. The dean of students should consciously attempt to manipulate certain aspects of the institutional environment in ways which support or promote development of individual students. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
19. Within the context of obvious individual differences in student ability and maturity, it is more desirable to err in the direction of over delegation of responsibility to students rather than in the direction of under delegation. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_

Please note that the title "Dean of Students," for purposes of this study, is synonymous with "Chief Student Personnel Administrator."

20. Students attain maturity to the extent that they are left free to make personal decisions and to exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship in the academic community. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
21. An essential ingredient for personalization in higher education is provision for privacy of the individual student. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
22. Except for considerations of safety, there is no justification for the dean of students to violate the confidentiality of a counseling relationship. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
23. Attempts by deans of students to influence students to adopt values held to be important by the institution are questionable behaviors. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
24. The essential ingredients of procedural due process are nothing more than a natural expression of the college's respect and concern for the individual student. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
25. Students by their nature desire liberalization of campus regulations. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
26. Students should not be involved in top level institutional policy decisions because they lack sufficient maturity. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
27. Although the results have been unfortunate in some instances, the present climate of dissent represents a significant positive development in higher education. Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
28. Rank in order of importance (1 = most important) the following reasons for involving students in policy decisions:  
 \_\_\_\_\_a. Contribute to the probability of insightful decisions.  
 \_\_\_\_\_b. Educate students for leadership and citizenship.  
 \_\_\_\_\_c. Satisfy the student's need for involvement and identification.  
 \_\_\_\_\_d. Lessen the possibility of student-administrative confrontation.
29. What role should the dean of students perform in the development in the area of student affairs? (Check one.)  
 \_\_\_\_\_a. Provide advice but not vote.  
 \_\_\_\_\_b. Participate as a voting member of a campus governance body.  
 \_\_\_\_\_c. Determine policy in consultation with students and faculty.  
 \_\_\_\_\_d. Determine policy without any requirement to consult with students and faculty.

30 - 31

# **DIRECTIONS:**

Indicate by checking the appropriate box, the degree to which you feel various members of the campus community should be involved in selected areas of decision making.

1. Primarily student
  2. Primarily administrative
  3. Primarily faculty
  4. Joint faculty-administrative with *no* student
  5. Primarily faculty-administrative with *some* student
  6. Joint faculty-student-administrative
30. Involvement in decisions affecting:
- |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Curriculum design.  | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| b. Visitation regulations for residence halls.                   | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| c. Women's hours.  | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| d. Academic grading practices.                                   | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| e. Use of alcoholic beverages.                                   | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| f. Employment and retention of faculty and administrative staff. | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| g. The institution's budget.                                     | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| h. Student government and activities.                            | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| i. Student publications and procedures related therein.          | — | — | — | — | — | — |

- |   |       |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|
| j. Academic standing.   | —     | — | — | — | — | — |
| k. Allocation and expenditure of student activity fees.                                 | —     | — | — | — | — | — |
| 31. Adjudication of:  |       |   |   |   |   |   |
| a. Student social conduct problems.   | —     | — | — | — | — | — |
| b. Student academic dishonesty.   | —     | — | — | — | — | — |
| 32. What criteria do you feel that your president uses to evaluate your effectiveness.* | _____ |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | _____ |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | _____ |   |   |   |   |   |

Please return to Thomas B. Dutton, Director of Research and Publications, NASPA, 202 Wilson Hall, Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan 48063.

\*Forms B and C were identical to Form A with two exceptions: Both asked respondents to indicate "How do you feel a dean of students would react to the same statement?" for Questions 1-27.

\*Form C's Question 32 asked, "What criteria do you use to evaluate the effectiveness of your dean of students."

# **Appendix B**

## **Tables 1-13**

**TABLE 1**  
**Institutional Affiliation by Type, Size, and Regional**  
**Accrediting Agency**

Category	Type						Size
	Public	Independent	Catholic	Protestant	Other (teacher technical community)	Not indicated	
Chief Student Personnel Administrator	158 34.5%	93 20.3%	70 15.3%	83 18.1%	50 10.9%	4 .9%	Less than 1,500 135 29.5%
Faculty Member	171 39.9%	91 21.2%	61 14.2%	72 16.7%	33 7.6%	2 .4%	1,500 - 5,000 126 29.5%
President	145 35.0%	85 20.6%	57 13.8%	73 17.6%	51 12.3%	3 .7%	132 31.9%
Student President	136 34.5%	107 27.2%	64 16.2%	51 12.9%	36 9.2%		117 29.7%
Student Editor	131 37.9%	85 24.6%	50 14.4%	47 13.6%	29 8.4%	5 1.1%	97 28.0%

TABLE 1, Continued

Size	Region					Total
	Not indicated	New England	North Central	Southern	Western - NW	
5,000 - 10,000						
Chief Stu. Personnel Adm.	83 18.1%	125 27.3%	189 41.3%	91 19.9%	49 10.7%	458
Faculty Member	3 .3%	116 27.1%	174 40.6%	88 20.6%	45 10.5%	430
President	73 17.6%	107 25.8%	183 44.2%	76 18.4%	46 11.1%	414
Student President	65 16.5%	113 28.7%	155 39.3%	65 16.5%	45 11.5%	394
Student Editor	66 19.1%	94 27.2%	129 37.3%	72 20.8%	37 10.7%	347
More than 10,000						
	2 .3%				16 4.0%	





TABLE 2

## Comparison of Sample with NASPA Membership for Goodness of Fit

As is noted below, a comparison was made between the NASPA membership and the respondents by size, type, and regional accrediting agency. This analysis was made by use of Chi-square.

One significant chi-square was obtained in fifteen comparisons. Only the returns by student body presidents do not compare favorably with the NASPA institutional membership by type.

Further analyses, not reported in this publication, were completed to determine whether each of the five sample groups responded in a proportionate manner. That is, if no bias was affecting the response patterns of each sample group, the same proportion of response could be expected for each group. For example, it would be expected that each of the five sample groups would compose 20 percent of the response from public schools. An unequal response pattern was noted from the Protestant schools and from institutions in the North Central region. In both cases, a less than expected response from students and a somewhat exaggerated response from the chief student personnel officer contributed to these differences. No other differences were noted.

With little exception, it appears that the groups were representative of the NASPA membership at the time of the study. The results of the study should not be ignored because of sample size.

	Type <sup>1</sup>	Size <sup>2</sup>	Region <sup>2</sup>
Dean of Students	1.39	2.67	.98
Faculty Member	6.07	1.19	.94
President	2.54	1.52	4.45
Student President	19.77	4.56	1.97
Student Editor	10.77	2.42	.86

<sup>1</sup>df=4,  $X^2_{.05}=9.488$

<sup>2</sup>df=3,  $X^2_{.05}=7.815$

<sup>3</sup>Significant at or beyond the .05 level of confidence as determined by chi-square

TABLE 3

## Justification for Use of Chi-square as an Appropriate Method of Analysis

It has been necessary to mount a defense against the limitation of comparing results among respondents which are not necessarily matched by institutions. The deans' responses on 8 of the first 27 items of the questionnaire, arbitrarily selected, were compared with the perceptions of his responses provided by *each* of the other four participants on the same items by three separate methods:

- Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) under the assumption that the groups are independent and the data uncorrelated (note same items, table 8);
- An estimate of the relationship between responses under the assumption that the groups are dependent and positively related:

$$Z = \frac{\hat{P}_1 - P_2}{\sqrt{\frac{P_1 Q_1}{n_1} + \frac{P_2 Q_2}{n_2} - 2(\phi) \sqrt{\frac{P_1 Q_1}{n_1}} \sqrt{\frac{P_2 Q_2}{n_2}}}}$$

where  $P_1$  = proportion agreeing on given time,  $P_1 \geq P_2$ ,  
 $P_2$  = proportion agreeing on given item (smaller of the two)  
 $Q_1 = 1 - P_1$   
 $Q_2 = 1 - P_2$   
 $\phi$  is estimated by randomly pairing 100 of each respondent

$$\phi = \sqrt{\frac{\text{computed statistic } X^2}{\text{total sample size used in random pairing}}}$$

- An estimate of the relationship using the maximum value that the correlation coefficient can reach given the percentages of agreement for the two groups (Guilford, *Psychometric Methods* p. 359). This is the least conservative method.

$$Z = \frac{\hat{P}_1 - P_2}{\sqrt{\frac{P_1 Q_1}{n_1} + \frac{P_2 Q_2}{n_2} - 2(\phi \text{ max}) \sqrt{\frac{P_1 Q_1}{n_1}} \sqrt{\frac{P_2 Q_2}{n_2}}}}$$

$$\phi \text{ max} = \sqrt{\frac{P_2}{Q_2} \cdot \frac{Q_1}{P_1}} \quad \text{if } P_1 \geq P_2$$

If the results obtained on each item sampled enabled rejection or acceptance of  $H_0$  of  $P_1 = P_2$  in all cases (a, b, and c above), it may be concluded that the responses on the item are unaffected by the assumption of dependence or independence, and it is safe to proceed. In this instance the  $X^2$  results provide the most conservative estimate of the real situation and are least likely to detect significant differences. If the results of (a) are not significant and (b) and (c) are significant it is likewise safe to proceed, but it may be concluded that the differences are underestimated and the report is conservative. If results of (a) enable rejection of  $H_0$  of  $P_1 = P_2$  while the results of (b) and (c) allow accepting the same hypothesis, it is not safe to proceed.

As noted below, in 22 of the 32 cases tested the results are unaffected by the assumption of dependence or independence. In 9 cases the  $X^2$  results represent a conservative estimate of the real situation, and it is still safe to proceed. In only one case (comparison of dean with faculty member on item 26), it is not safe to proceed.

On the basis of these results it has been determined that use of chi-square, though not entirely appropriate, is a useful method by which the results of this study may be analyzed and reported.

TABLE 3

Justification for Use of Chi-square as an Appropriate Method of Analysis

	Items	$X^2_1$	$\phi$ random pairing <sub>2</sub>	$\phi$ max
Dean and President	Item 1	•	6.16*	7.80*
	2	NS	1.67NS	1.67NS
	3	•	8.20*	8.00*
	13	•	7.78*	7.78*
	15	•	2.78*	4.55*
	25	NS	2.67*	5.33*
	26	•	12.25*	9.80*
	27	•	8.75	10.00*
Dean and Faculty Member	1	NS	1.25NS	4.00*
	2	•	5.00*	8.20*
	3	NS	.70NS	1.67NS
	13	NS	1.33NS	2.86*
	15	NS	2.20NS	4.00*
	25	•	2.42NS	2.86*
	26	•	1.60NS	1.61NS
	27	•	3.57*	5.27*
Dean and Student President	1	NS	1.47NS	4.55*
	2	NS	.97NS	2.73*
	3	•	4.00*	6.67*
	13	•	11.70*	4.37*
	15	NS	2.22NS	4.00*
	25	•	4.30*	6.50*
	26	•	5.60*	6.20*
	27	•	6.33*	7.60*
Dean and Student Editor	1	•	6.19*	10.00*
	2	NS	.91NS	2.73*
	3	•	7.56*	9.33*
	13	•	3.98*	5.55*
	15	NS	1.10NS	2.86*
	25	•	2.67*	5.30*
	26	•	7.90*	7.60*
	27	•	10.23*	10.60*

(1) Results and statements listed in more detail, table 8

(2) In columns (b) and (c)  $H_0$  of  $P_1 = P_2$  was rejected if  $Z \geq + 2.58 \leq -2.58$ ;  $\alpha = .01$ .

(3) Significant results by means described

**TABLE 4**  
Differences in the Dean of Students' Assumptions and Beliefs  
by Type, Size, and Regional Accrediting Agency  
Statement

	Type <sub>1</sub>	Size <sub>2</sub>	Region <sub>2</sub>
1. Deans' relationship with students has priority over administrative tasks.	5.542	10.255* <sup>3</sup>	0.681
2. Counseling and discipline are interrelated responsibilities of the dean.	7.785	0.258	1.955
3. Dean's primary commitment is to the student.	3.179	1.811	6.416
4. Dean's responsibility to the president should take precedence over personal convictions.	4.096	6.693	5.070
5. Dean must uphold sensitive standards that cannot be specified in a code.	5.566	6.194	0.303
6. Dean must be willing to engage in conflict with students when he disagrees with them.			
7. Dean should disassociate himself from unpopular administrative decisions.	2.641	1.368	0.827
8. Dean's effectiveness is reduced by over-concern with control and order.	0.622	1.469	1.273
9. Dean should be concerned with enforcement of moral standards.	8.122	0.666	5.466
10. Purpose of conduct regulation is to maintain control and order.	7.238	5.811	13.952*
11. Insertion of staff between the dean and students contributes to depersonalization	3.611	3.800	1.593
12. Only justification of conduct regulation is that it prohibits behavior that interferes with student growth.	13.165*	16.471*	7.941
13. Behavior of members of the academic community must be restricted in special ways.	12.726*	1.192	0.191
14. Social maturity and value development should be institutional concerns.	10.678*	7.714	2.280
15. Social maturity and value development are integral to intellectual attainment.	4.422	3.497	0.393
16. Exceptions to policy are likely to reinforce unacceptable behavior.	5.788	3.447	3.143
17. Dean's attempt to protect students from defeats may hinder growth.	1.975	0.441	1.148
18. Dean should manipulate environment to promote student development.	2.402	3.247	4.365
19. Over-delegation of responsibility to students is more desirable than under-delegation.	2.475	5.369	2.826
20. Maturity is attained through freedom to make personal decisions and to exercise citizenship rights and responsibility.	3.748	2.350	2.778
21. Provision for privacy is essential for personalization.	3.802	7.308	1.701
22. Dean should not violate confidentiality of a counseling relationship.	5.226	2.792	9.133*
23. Dean's attempt to influence students to adopt institutional values is questionable behavior.	6.146	0.333	1.416
24. Procedural due process is essentially a reflection of respect and concern for the individual.	1.324	6.487	1.579
25. Students by their nature desire liberalization of regulations.	7.318	2.440	3.709
26. Students lack maturity to participate in top-level policy decisions.	5.191	3.186	13.022*
27. Although there have been negative results, present dissent has been a positive development.	6.306	3.417	0.577
1. X <sup>2</sup> at .05 level with 4df is 9.488. 2. X <sup>2</sup> at .05 level with 3df is 7.815.	6.949	3.060	11.552*

3. \* = Significant at or beyond the .05 level of confidence as determined by chi-square.

TABLE 5  
Comparison of Assumptions and Beliefs Among Selected Members of the Academic Community

Statement	Chi-Square Analysis <sup>1</sup>	Dean (N=458)				President (N=414)				Faculty Member (N=430)				Student Body President (N=394)				Student Editor (N=348)			
		A <sup>2</sup>		D		A		D		A		D		A		D		A		D	
		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%	
1. Dean's relationship with students has priority over administrative tasks.	S	74	26	71	29	80	20	79	21	81	19										
2. Counseling and discipline are interrelated responsibilities of the dean.	S	78	22	70	30	67	33	52	48	54	46										
3. Dean's primary commitment is to the student.	S	82	18	66	34	73	27	70	30	71	29										
4. Dean's responsibility to the president should take precedence over personal convictions.	S	25	75	35	65	18	82	14	86	15	85										
5. Dean must uphold sensitive standards that cannot be specified in a code.	S	59	41	69	31	58	42	51	49	47	53										
6. Dean must be willing to engage in conflict with students when he disagrees with them.	S	91	9	90	10	90	10	84	26	90	10										
7. Dean should disassociate himself from unpopular administrative decisions.	S	6	94	8	92	12	88	17	83	21	79										
8. Dean's effectiveness is reduced by over-concern with control and order.	S	76	24	66	34	75	25	77	23	74	26										
9. Dean should be concerned with enforcement of moral standards.	S	41	59	58	42	46	54	31	69	27	73										
10. Purpose of conduct regulation is to maintain control and order.	NS	77	23	82	18	79	21	82	18	75	25										
11. Insertion of staff between the dean and students contributes to depersonalization.	NS	60	40	57	43	65	35	63	37	65	35										
12. Only justification of conduct regulation is that it prohibits behavior that interferes with student growth.	S	27	73	25	75	38	62	38	62	39	61										
13. Behavior of members of the academic community must be restricted in special ways.	S	76	24	84	16	71	29	51	49	43	57										
14. Social maturity and value development should be institutional concerns.	S	99	1	99	1	96	4	86	14	80	20										
15. Social maturity and value development are integral to intellectual attainment.	NS	90	10	92	8	85	15	89	11	87	13										
16. Exceptions to policy are likely to reinforce unacceptable behavior.	S	22	78	40	60	32	68	33	67	32	68										

TABLE 5, Continued

17. Dean's attempt to protect students from defeats may hinder growth.	S	88	12	78	22	84	16	91	9	92	8
18. Dean should manipulate the environment to promote student development.	S	85	15	78	22	72	28	69	31	68	32
19. Overdelegation of responsibility to students is more desirable than under-delegation.	S	89	11	85	15	79	21	78	22	80	20
20. Maturity is attained through freedom to make personal decisions and to exercise citizenship rights and responsibility.	S	89	11	85	15	85	15	92	8	92	8
21. Provision for privacy is essential for personalization.	NS	89	11	87	13	90	10	87	13	92	8
22. Dean should not violate confidentiality of a counseling relationship.	S	90	10	87	13	88	12	93	7	93	7
23. Dean's attempt to influence students to adopt institutional values is questionable behavior.	S	29	71	18	82	33	67	76	24	77	23
24. Procedural due process is essentially a reflection of respect and concern for the individual.	S	85	15	85	15	79	21	61	39	55	45
25. Students by their nature desire liberalization of regulations.	NS	75	25	80	20	77	23	75	25	76	24
26. Students lack maturity to participate in top-level policy decisions.	S	11	89	24	76	31	69	4	96	10	90
27. Although there have been negative results, present dissent has been a positive development.	S	88	12	76	24	75	25	83	17	86	14

1. S = Significant at or beyond the .01 level of confidence as determined by chi-square.

2. A = Agree D = Disagree

TABLE 6

Comparison of the Dean of Students' Assumptions and Beliefs With the Perceptions of Them Held by Other Participants

Statements	Chi-Square Analysis <sup>1</sup>				Dean				President				Faculty Member				Student Body President				Student Editor			
	S	A <sup>2</sup>	D	%	A	D	%	%	A	D	%	%	A	D	%	%	A	D	%	%	A	D	%	%
1. Dean's relationship with students has priority over administrative tasks.	S	74	26	78	22	69	31	54	46	50	50													
2. Counseling and discipline are interrelated responsibilities of the dean.	S	78	22	64	36	75	25	75	25	77	23													
3. Dean's primary commitment is to the student.	S	82	18	80	20	70	30	55	45	59	41													
4. Dean's responsibility to the president should take precedence over personal convictions.	S	25	75	25	75	30	70	47	53	48	52													
5. Dean must uphold sensitive standards that cannot be specified in a code.	S	59	41	76	24	74	26	85	15	87	13													
6. Dean must be willing to engage in conflict with students when he disagrees with them.	S	91	9	75	25	75	25	82	18	77	23													
7. Dean should disassociate himself from unpopular administrative decisions.	S	6	94	34	66	30	70	19	81	19	81													
8. Dean's effectiveness is reduced by over-concern with control and order.	S	76	24	75	25	68	32	41	59	37	63													
9. Dean should be concerned with enforcement of moral standards.	S	41	59	52	48	62	38	73	27	81	19													
10. Purpose of conduct regulation is to maintain control and order.	S	77	23	82	18	87	13	94	6	93	7													
11. Insertion of staff between the dean and students contributes to depersonalization.	S	60	40	45	55	45	55	41	59	47	53													
12. Only justification of conduct regulation is that it prohibits behavior that interferes with student growth.	S	27	73	35	65	42	58	30	70	41	59													
13. Behavior of members of the academic community must be restricted in special ways.	S	76	24	83	17	83	17	86	14	90	10													
14. Social maturity and value development should be institutional concerns.	S	99	1	99	1	99	1	96	4	95	5													

TABLE 6, Continued

15. Social maturity and value development are integral to intellectual attainment.	NS	90	10	94	6	94	6	92	8	95	5
16. Exceptions to policy are likely to reinforce unacceptable behavior.	S	22	78	40	60	47	53	63	37	67	33
17. Dean's attempt to protect students from defeats may hinder growth.	S	88	12	70	30	68	32	61	39	62	38
18. Dean should manipulate the environment to promote student development.	S	85	15	83	17	78	22	73	27	73	27
19. Overdelegation of responsibility to students is more desirable than under-delegation.	S	89	11	86	14	64	36	43	57	38	62
20. Maturity is attained through freedom to make personal decisions and to exercise citizenship rights and responsibility.	S	89	11	90	10	85	15	77	23	73	27
21. Provision for privacy is essential for personalization.	S	89	11	90	10	88	12	78	22	78	22
22. Dean should not violate confidentiality of a counseling relationship.	S	90	10	90	10	80	20	76	24	72	28
23. Dean's attempt to influence students to adopt institutional values is questionable behavior.	NS	29	71	32	68	30	70	34	66	30	70
24. Procedural due process is essentially a reflection of respect and concern for the individual.	NS	85	15	86	14	84	16	80	20	84	16
25. Students by their nature desire liberalization of regulations.	S	75	25	83	17	88	12	83	17	83	17
26. Students lack maturity to participate in top-level policy decisions.	S	11	89	21	79	39	61	46	54	60	40
27. Although there have been negative results, present dissent has been a positive development.	S	88	12	78	22	69	31	57	43	53	47

1. S = Significant at or beyond the .01 level of confidence as determined by chi-square.

2. A = Agree D = Disagree



TABLE 7  
Comparison of the Dean of Students' Assumptions and  
Beliefs with *Each* of the Other Participants'

Statement	Dean- Student President	Dean- Faculty	Dean- Student President	Dean- Student Editor
1. Dean's relationship with students has priority over administrative tasks.	NS <sup>1,2</sup>	NS	NS	NS
2. Counseling and discipline are interrelated responsibilities of the dean.	•	•	•	•
3. Dean's primary commitment is to the student.	•	•	•	•
4. Dean's responsibility to the president should take precedence over personal convictions.	•	NS	•	•
5. Dean must uphold sensitive standards that cannot be specified in code.	•	NS	•	•
6. Dean must be willing to engage in conflict with students when he disagrees with them.	NS	NS	•	NS
7. Dean should disassociate himself from unpopular administrative decisions.	NS	•	•	•
8. Dean's effectiveness is reduced by over-concern with control and order.	•	NS	NS	NS
9. Dean should be concerned with enforcement of moral standards.	•	NS	•	•
10. Purpose of conduct regulation is to maintain control and order.	NS	NS	NS	NS
11. Insertion of staff between the dean and students contributes to depersonalization.	NS	NS	NS	NS
12. Only justification of conduct regulation is that it prohibits behavior that interferes with student growth.	NS	•	•	•
13. Behavior of members of the academic community must be restricted in special ways.	•	NS	•	•
14. Social maturity and value development should be institutional concerns.	NS	NS	•	•
15. Social maturity and value development are integral to intellectual attainment.	NS	NS	NS	NS
16. Exceptions to policy are likely to reinforce unacceptable behavior.	•	•	•	•
17. Dean's attempt to protect students from defeats may hinder growth.	•	NS	NS	NS
18. Dean should manipulate environment to promote student development.	NS	•	•	•
19. Over-delegation of responsibility to students is more desirable than underdelegation.	NS	•	•	•
20. Maturity is attained through freedom to make personal decisions and to exercise citizenship rights and responsibility.	NS	NS	NS	NS
21. Provision for privacy is essential for personalization.	NS	NS	NS	NS
22. Dean should not violate confidentiality of a counseling relationship.	NS	NS	NS	NS
23. Dean's attempt to influence students to adopt institutional values is questionable behavior.	•	NS	•	•

TABLE 7, Continued

24. Procedural due process is essentially a reflection of respect and concern for the individual.	NS	NS	•
25. Students by their nature desire liberalization of regulations.	NS	NS	NS
26. Students lack maturity to participate in top level policy decisions.	•	•	NS
27. Although there have been negative results, present dissent has been a positive development.	•	•	NS
1. Proportions agreeing and disagreeing on each item are noted in Table 5.			
2. NS = Not significant at or beyond the .01 level of confidence as determined by chi-square.			
3. • = Significant at or beyond the .01 level of confidence as determined by chi-square.			

TABLE 8  
Comparison of the Dean of Students' Assumptions and Beliefs  
With the Perceptions of His Assumptions and Beliefs  
Held by *Each* of the Other Participants

Statement	Dean- President NS <sup>1,2</sup> • <sup>3</sup>	Dean- Faculty NS	Dean- Student President •	Dean- Student Editor •
1. Dean's relationship with students has priority over administrative tasks.	NS	NS	•	•
2. Counseling and discipline are interrelated responsibilities of the dean.	•	•	•	•
3. Dean's primary commitment is to the student.	NS	NS	•	NS
4. Dean's responsibility to the president should take precedence over personal convictions.	NS	•	•	•
5. Dean must uphold sensitive standards that cannot be specified in code.	•	•	•	•
6. Dean must be willing to engage in conflict with students when he disagrees with them.	•	•	•	•
7. Dean should disassociate himself from unpopular administrative decisions.	NS	•	•	•
8. Dean's effectiveness is reduced by over-concern with control and order.	•	•	•	•
9. Dean should be concerned with enforcement of moral standards.	NS	•	•	•
10. Purpose of conduct regulation is to maintain control and order.	NS	•	•	•
11. Insertion of staff between the dean and students contributes to depersonalization.	•	•	•	•
12. Only justification of conduct regulation is that it prohibits behavior that interferes with student growth.	NS	•	NS	•
13. Behavior of members of the academic community must be restricted in special ways.	NS	•	•	•
14. Social maturity and value development should be institutional concerns.	NS	NS	•	•
15. Social maturity and value development are integral to intellectual attainment.	NS	NS	NS	•
16. Exceptions to policy are likely to reinforce unacceptable behavior.	•	•	•	•
17. Dean's attempt to protect students from defeats may hinder growth.	•	•	•	•
18. Dean should manipulate environment to promote student development.	NS	NS	•	•
19. Over-delegation of responsibility to students is more desirable than underdelegation.	NS	•	•	•
20. Maturity is attained through freedom to make personal decisions and to exercise citizenship rights and responsibility.	NS	NS	•	•
21. Provision for privacy is essential for personalization.	NS	NS	•	•
22. Dean should not violate confidentiality of a counseling relationship.	NS	•	•	•
23. Dean's attempt to influence students to adopt institutional values is questionable behavior.	NS	NS	NS	NS

TABLE 8, Continued

24. Procedural due process is essentially a reflection of respect and concern for the individual.	NS	NS	NS	NS
25. Students by their nature desire liberalization of regulations.	*	*	*	NS
26. Students lack maturity to participate in top level policy decisions.	*	*	*	NS
27. Although there have been negative results, present dissent has been a positive development.	*	*	*	*
1. Proportions agreeing and disagreeing on each item is noted in Table 6.				
2. NS = Not significant at or beyond the .01 level of confidence as determined by chi-square.				
3. * = Significant at or beyond the .01 level of confidence as determined by chi-square.				

TABLE 9

Comparison of the Assumptions and Beliefs of *Each* of the Other Four Participants with What *Each* Thought a Dean of Students Assumes and Believes

Statement	President	Faculty	Student President	Student Editor
1. Dean's relationship with students has priority over administrative tasks.	NS <sup>1,2</sup>	*	*	*
2. Counseling and discipline are interrelated responsibilities of the dean.	NS	*	*	*

3. Dean's primary commitment is to the student.	••	•	•	•
4. Dean's responsibility to the president should take precedence over personal convictions.	•	•	•	•
5. Dean must uphold sensitive standards that cannot be specified in code.	NS	•	•	•
6. Dean must be willing to engage in conflict with students when he disagrees with them.	•	•	•	•
7. Dean should disassociate himself from unpopular administrative decisions.	•	•	•	•
8. Dean's effectiveness is reduced by over-concern with control and order.	•	•	•	•
9. Dean should be concerned with enforcement of moral standards.	NS	•	•	•
10. Purpose of conduct regulation is to maintain control and order.	NS	•	•	•
11. Insertion of staff between the dean and students contributes to depersonalization.	•	•	•	•
12. Only justification of conduct regulation is that it prohibits behavior that interferes with student growth.	•	•	•	•
13. Behavior of members of the academic community must be restricted in special ways.	NS	•	•	•
14. Social maturity and value development should be institutional concerns.	NS	•	•	•
15. Social maturity and value development are integral to intellectual attainment.	NS	•	•	•
16. Exceptions to policy are likely to reinforce unacceptable behavior.	NS	•	•	•
17. Dean's attempt to protect students from defeats may hinder growth.	NS	•	•	•
18. Dean should manipulate environment to promote student development.	NS	•	•	•
19. Over-delegation of responsibility to students is more desirable than underdelegation.	NS	•	•	•
20. Maturity is attained through freedom to make personal decisions and to exercise citizenship rights and responsibility.	NS	•	•	•
21. Provision for privacy is essential for personalization.	NS	•	•	•
22. Dean should not violate confidentiality of a counseling relationship.	NS	•	•	•
23. Dean's attempt to influence students to adopt institutional values is questionable behavior.	•	•	•	•
24. Procedural due process is essentially a reflection of respect and concern for the individual.	NS	•	•	•
25. Students by their nature desire liberalization of regulations.	NS	•	•	•
26. Students lack maturity to participate in top level policy decisions.	NS	•	•	•
27. Although there have been negative results, present dissent has been a positive development.	NS	•	•	•
1. Proportions agreeing and disagreeing on each item are noted in Tables 5 and 6.	NS	•	•	•
2. NS = Not significant at or beyond the .01 level of confidence as measured by chi-square.				
3. • = Significant at or beyond the .01 level of confidence as measured by chi-square.				

**TABLE 10**  
**Preferred Role of the Dean of Students in Policy Formulation in Student Affairs**

Category	Dean (N=454)	President (N=401)	Faculty Member (N=418)	Student Body President (N=389)	Student Editor (N=339)
	%	%	%	%	%
Provide advice but not vote	6.8	8.2	14.8	36.5	41.6
Participate as a voting member of a campus governance body	38.5	36.4	32.5	27.0	26.3
Determine policy in consultation with students and faculty	54.2	55.1	52.7	36.5	31.8
Determine policy without any requirement to consult with students and faculty	.5	.3	0.0	0.0	.3

**TABLE 11**  
**Comparison of the Deans of Students' Perceptions  
of their Presidents' Evaluative Criteria  
With Criteria Actually Reported by the Presidents<sup>1</sup>**

Criteria Used to Evaluate Dean's Performance	Dean (N=632) <sup>2</sup>		President (N=474)	
	N	%	N	%
Maintenance of control and order	80	12.7	14	3.0
Relations with members of the academic community	142	22.5	148	31.1
Administrative competence and effectiveness	125	19.8	96	20.3
Creative and innovative leadership	59	9.3	39	8.2
Support of campus policies and objectives	48	7.6	42	8.9
Maintenance of campus morale	45	7.1	30	6.3
Contribution to student development and assessment of student need	60	9.5	62	13.1
Personal values and character	5	.8	14	3.0
Unknown	59	9.3	20	4.2
Others	9	1.4	9	1.9
Total	632		474	

- 1 A statistically significant difference exists between the responses of the Deans and the Presidents at the .01 level of confidence as determined by use of chi-square.
- 2 N inflated by combination response. The first two responses from an individual were tabulated if more than one was recorded.

**TABLE 12**  
Principal Reasons for Involving Students in Policy Decisions<sup>1</sup>  
(First Choices Only)

Category	Dean (N=451) %	President (N=400) %	Faculty Member (N=420) %	Student Body President (N=391) %	Student Editor (N=343) %
Contribute to probability of insightful decisions	55.4	45.0	39.8	65.8	60.3
Educate students for leadership and citizenship	31.7	43.0	37.8	21.4	21.9
Satisfy students' need for involvement and identification	12.4	9.7	19.5	8.7	9.9
Lessen possibility of student-administration confrontation	.5	2.3	2.9	4.1	7.9

<sup>1</sup> A statistically significant difference exists among responses of the total academic community at the .01 level of confidence as determined by use of chi-square.

**TABLE 13**  
To What Degree Should Members of the Academic Community  
Be Involved in Selected Areas of Governance and Decision-Making

	Dean Choice (1)	% (2)	President Choice	%	Faculty Choice	%	Student President Choice	%	Student Editor Choice	%
Academic Matters										
Curriculum design	5	54	5	48	5	39	6	57	6	51
Grading practices	5	39	3	48	3	55	6	44	6	45
Academic standing	3	33	3	54	3	52	6	33	6	36
Employment and Retention of Faculty and Staff	5	39	4	45	4	46	5	46	5	39
Institution's Budget	2	43	2	45	2	37	2	44	2	48
Parietal Rules										
Women's hours	6	53	6	52	6	45	1	64	1	61
Visitation regulations residence halls	6	57	6	59	6	47	1	65	1	66
Use of alcoholic beverages	6	59	6	49	6	46	6	49	6	43
Student Activity Matters										
Allocation of student activity fees	1	65	1	60	1	56	1	78	1	66
Student gov't. and activities	1	77	1	73	1	75	1	91	1	92
Student publications	1	61	1	57	1	62	1	88	1	93
Adjudication of:										
(a) Social conduct problems	6	67	6	62	6	53	1	51	1	49
(b) Academic dishonesty problems	6	62	6	50	6	56	6	52	6	45
(1) Selection Code.			(2) % =	Percentage of respondents selecting the particular code as their first choice						
1. Primarily student										
2. Primarily administrative										
3. Primarily faculty										
4. Joint faculty-administrative no student										
5. Primarily faculty-administrative with some student										
6. Joint faculty-student-administrative										











